

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. In the above referenced Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-13, 15-25, 27-49, 51-61, and 63 under 35 USC § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Humpleman (U.S. Patent No. 6,005,861); and claims 14, 26, 50, and 62 under 35 USC § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman (U.S. Patent No. 6,005,861) in view of Tamura (U.S. Patent No. 5,801,776). The Examiner has objected to claim 34 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The rejections and objections have been traversed and, as such, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the allowability of claims 1-63.

2. Claims 1-13, 15-25, 27-49, 51-61, and 63 have been rejected under 35 USC § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Humpleman (U.S. Patent No. 6,005,861). The applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's arguments supporting this rejection.

The present invention of claim 1 claims a method for channel mixing in a multimedia system that begins by receiving a set of channels as encoded channel data. The method continues by interpreting the encoded channel data to identify a channel of interest of the set of channels based on a specific channel selection request. The method continues by processing data of the channel of interest based on type of channel to produce generic data. The method continues by converting the generic data into a stream of data.

In contrast, Humpleman teaches a home multimedia network architecture as shown in Figures 1 and 2. The network includes a plurality of network interface units (NIU) 32, an internal network 34 (e.g., Ethernet twisted pair or a special switch hub - column 3, lines 49 - 55) or switch hub 38, computers 20, set-top boxes 40, a printer 24 and end-user devices 12, 14, 16, 18, 22, 22, and 24. As is further shown analog lines bypass the internal network 34.

Humpleman further teaches that, by separating the network connection from the set-top box functionality, multiple set-top boxes can be distributed throughout a home and coupled to an NIU unit. (column 5, lines 4-19)

Humpleman still further teaches that the number of NIU 32 required for the network is dependent upon the number of streams required per home, where a stream corresponds to different external sources (e.g., Cable, ISDN, Broadcast of Figure 1) and not by the number of terminals in the home. (column 3, lines 37 - 43)

Humpleman further teaches that the NIU 32 and hub 38 function to route digital data between one of the external sources and one or more of the set-top boxes 40 or computers 20. The format of the digital data that is conveyed between the set-top boxes 40 and the external source is not changed. In particular, Humpleman teaches that, "According to the present invention, MPEG digital video is retained throughout the network 10. Conversion to real video takes place only at the display device or the set-top box 40". (column 5, line 66, - column 6, line 3)

Humpleman further teaches that cable or antenna television is retained unmodified with distribution by regular in-home coax. (column 3, lines 44-46).

Thus, the multimedia network of Humpleman allows for a single connection to an external source (e.g., cable, ISDN, Broadcast, as shown in Figures 1 and 2) and data of the external source to be distributed to multiple set-top boxes and computers, wherein, the format of the data is retained throughout the network.

As such, Humpleman does not teach or suggest the steps of processing data of the channel of interest to produce generic data and converting the generic data into a stream of data as is claimed in claim 1 since Humpleman teaches retaining the format of the data throughout the network. Thus, the applicant believes that claim 1 overcomes the present rejection.

Claims 2-13 and 15 are dependent upon claim 1 and introduce additional patentable subject matter. Accordingly, the applicant believes that the same reasons that distinguish claim 1 over the present rejection are applicable in distinguishing these claims over the same rejection.

Claim 16 is a method that includes the steps of processing data of the channel of interest based on the type of data to produce generic data and converting the generic data into a stream of data. Since Humpleman does not teach or suggest such steps, the applicant believes that claim 16 overcomes the present rejection.

Claims 17 - 25 and 27 are dependent upon claim 16 and introduce additional patentable subject matter. Accordingly, the applicant believes that the same reasons that distinguish claim 16 over the present rejection are applicable in distinguishing these claims over the same rejection.

Claim 28 claims a channel mixer that includes the limitations of generating generic data for at least one of the channels of the set of channels and converting the generic data into a stream of data. Since Humpleman does not teach or suggest such steps, the applicant believes that claim 28 overcomes the present rejection.

Claims 29 - 36 are dependent upon claim 28 and introduce additional patentable subject matter. Accordingly, the applicant believes that the same reasons that distinguish claim 28 over the present rejection are applicable in distinguishing these claims over the same rejection.

Claim 37 claims an apparatus that includes the limitations of processing data of the channel of interest based on the type of data to produce generic data and converting the generic data into a stream of data. Since Humpleman does not teach or suggest such steps, the applicant believes that claim 37 overcomes the present rejection.

Claims 38 - 49 and 50 are dependent upon claim 37 and introduce additional patentable subject matter.

Accordingly, the applicant believes that the same reasons that distinguish claim 37 over the present rejection are applicable in distinguishing these claims over the same rejection.

Claim 52 claims an apparatus that includes the limitations of processing data of the channel of interest based on the type of data to produce generic data and converting the generic data into a stream of data. Since Humpleman does not teach or suggest such steps, the applicant believes that claim 52 overcomes the present rejection.

Claims 53 - 61 and 60 are dependent upon claim 52 and introduce additional patentable subject matter. Accordingly, the applicant believes that the same reasons that distinguish claim 52 over the present rejection are applicable in distinguishing these claims over the same rejection.

3. Claims 14, 26, 50, and 62 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman (U.S. Patent No. 6,005,861) in view of Tamura (U.S. Patent No. 5,801,776). The applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's arguments supporting this rejection.

Since each of these claims are dependent claims of claims that have been shown to overcome the above rejection, the applicant believes that the combined teachings of Humpleman and Tamura fail to render the present claims obvious since Humpleman does not teach or

suggest the steps of processing data of the channel of interest based on the type of data to produce generic data and converting the generic data into a stream of data. As such, the applicant believes that claims 14, 26, 50, and 62 overcome the present rejection.

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant believes that claims 1-63 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that they be passed to allowance.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone or facsimile if the Examiner believes that such a communication would advance the prosecution of the present invention.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

By: /Timothy W. Markison reg. 33,534/
Timothy W. Markison
Phone: (512) 342-0612
Fax No. (512) 342-1674

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

37 C.F.R 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Alexandria, Virginia 22313, on the date below:

11-22-05
Date


Signature